## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JEAN KILGORE, Executrix of the Estate of : Consolidated under VICTOR KILGORE, and widow in her own : MDL Docket No. 875

right,

Plaintiffs,

:

: C.A. No. 2:13-cv-4029-ER

v. :

: ASBESTOS CASE

:

DAP, INC., et al., : Philadelphia County Court

of Common PleasJune Term, 2013

Defendants. : No. 0881

## DEFENDANT, DAP, INC.'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Plaintiffs' Opposition proffers no issue of material fact, and summary judgment must be granted. Plaintiffs have yet to provide any evidence of asbestos content in the DAP glazing and caulk used by Mr. Kilgore. Importantly, Plaintiffs concede that DAP never manufactured an asbestos-containing spackle or joint compound.<sup>1</sup> As such, the only two DAP products at issue are window glazing and caulk, and Plaintiffs have produced no evidence establishing asbestos content in either product.<sup>2</sup>

In their very first sentence, Plaintiffs <u>concede</u> that Mr. Kilgore had *no knowledge of*asbestos content in any DAP product.<sup>4</sup> This is not disputed. Moreover, neither Mr. Kilgore nor

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Plaintiffs' Opposition, p. 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Plaintiffs' Opposition, p. 1, setting forth that Mr. Kilore identified DAP glazing and Mr. Miller identified DAP caulk; see also, DAP's Motion for Summary Judgment.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Notably, in their Opposition, Plaintiffs falsely and illogically assert that Mr. Kilgore and Mr. Miller identified the same DAP product, an "asbestos glazing compound", with allegedly conflicting levels of exposure resulting in an alleged issue of fact for the jury. (*See* Plaintiffs' Opposition, pp. 1-2.) This is absolutely false, as Plaintiffs themselves well know. Mr. Kilgore identified DAP glazing, which he only used 10 times, and Mr. Miller identified a DAP caulk - many of which were always asbestos-free. Plaintiffs themselves confirm these very facts in their Opposition. To claim otherwise, in contradiction to other content within that very same Opposition, is an utterly disingenuous and red-herring effort to create a fantastical issue of fact where none exists.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Plaintiffs' Opposition, p. 1.

Mr. Miller could confirm that the DAP glazing and caulk were used prior to 1979 (the year in which all DAP products were henceforth asbestos-free). Significantly, Mr. Kilgore did not know when he first used DAP glazing<sup>5</sup>, and Mr. Miller, who did not even work with Mr. Kilgore until the 1980s, admittedly did not know if DAP caulk was used at Aberdeen prior to the 1980s.<sup>6</sup>

Despite the above, in a roundabout and completely illogical attempt to establish asbestos content, Plaintiffs now press a "stockpiling" argument, falsely asserting that the DAP products were stockpiled, and therefore must have existed at Aberdeen prior to 1979, and therefore must have contained asbestos.<sup>7</sup>

This argument is completely unfounded, as Plaintiffs' Opposition lacks any evidence establishing that DAP glazing and caulk even existed at Aberdeen prior to 1979, let alone their premise of "stockpiling". No witness testified to any stockpiling of any DAP product. To the contrary, Mr. Kilgore swore that he simply grabbed a can of DAP glazing from the supply center. He offered no testimony that the glazing was "stock-piled" at all. In fact, he could not establish he used DAP glazing prior to 1979.

Mr. Miller, who did not even work with Mr. Kilgore until the 1980s, similarly could not establish that DAP caulk was used at Aberdeen prior to the 1980s, stating he "can't speak for certain".<sup>12</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Relevant portions of Plaintiff's discovery testimony attached hereto as Exhibit A, at 265:14-20.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Relevant portions of Mr. Miller's videotaped trial testimony attached hereto as Exhibit B, at 21:13-22:1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Plaintiffs, Opposition, p. 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See DAP's Motion for Summary Judgment; see also, Plaintiffs' Opposition, lacking any evidence establishing even the existence of DAP glazing and caulk at Aberdeen prior to 1979, let alone their premise of "stockpiling".

<sup>9</sup> Exhibit A, at 285:9-23.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See DAP's Motion for Summary Judgment; see also, Plaintiffs' Opposition, lacking any testimonial evidence establishing their "stockpiling" assertion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Exhibit A, 265:14-20.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Exhibit B, 21:13-22:1.

In a second unfounded attempt to establish asbestos content, Plaintiffs assert that only DAP brand glazing and caulk were used at Aberdeen, and therefore those DAP products must have been used at Aberdeen prior to 1979, and therefore must have contained asbestos.<sup>13</sup> Again, the very premise of Plaintiffs' argument is borne out as false. As stated above, neither Plaintiff nor Mr. Miller could establish that DAP glazing and caulk were present and/or used at Aberdeen prior to 1979.<sup>14</sup> In fact, Mr. Kilgore additionally testified that he could have been using a different brand of glazing at any given time. 15 Clearly, there is no basis for Plaintiffs' presentday assertion that only DAP glazing and caulk were used prior to 1979, since both Plaintiff himself and his co-worker frankly and plainly denied any support for this point.

Plaintiffs also sidestep the critical point that many DAP caulks were asbestos-free prior to 1979. As such, even if Plaintiff had used DAP caulk prior to 1979, there still is no evidence of asbestos content. Given Plaintiffs' failure to produce even a scintilla of admissible evidence of asbestos content, it remains just as likely that the caulk was an asbestos-free composition. Any conclusion in this regard would be an utter gamble, and asking a jury to make that determination would not only be unfair, it would be impermissible guesswork lacking any basis in fact. There is simply no way for Plaintiffs, or anyone, to establish asbestos content in the identified caulk. Summary judgment should be granted.

Finally, as to the glazing, even if Plaintiffs had established that Mr. Kilgore used it prior to 1979 and that it therefore contained asbestos, Plaintiffs concede that Mr. Kilgore only used it

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> See Plaintiffs' Opposition, p. 1.<sup>14</sup> See supra.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> See DAP's Motion for Summary Judgment and Exhibit B attached thereto.

10 times.<sup>17</sup> Plaintiffs nonetheless argue that "it does not tell us how much exposure he actually had".<sup>18</sup> Critically, however, Plaintiff admitted that these 10 occasions were actually only 10 windows in total over his lifetime, which he himself defined as "not often".<sup>19</sup> Plaintiff further testified that he did not sand the glazing and that it was not dusty.<sup>20</sup> Thus, even if he had used the DAP glazing prior to 1979, clearly "we" know exactly how much "exposure" Plaintiff had – zero to de minimis, at best.

This issue was recently addressed by The Honorable Judge Robreno in the <u>Palmer</u> case, where Judge Robreno applied <u>Gregg</u> and determined that the decedent's exposure was *de minimis*, thereby resulting in summary judgment for the defendant. The Court held that even if the defendant were liable for the raw asbestos on the defendant's machines, **plaintiff's evidence was that, over the course of 15 years, the decedent only experienced exposure to the raw asbestos "a handful of times".<sup>21</sup> The Court further held:** 

Therefore, applying Pennsylvania law, no reasonable jury could conclude from the evidence that Plaintiff's exposure to this asbestos was a substantial factor in the development of his mesothelioma.<sup>22</sup>

The facts of the instant matter warrant summary judgment even more so than in <u>Palmer</u>. Mr. Kilgore admittedly only used the DAP glazing 10 times, an amount that he defined as "not often". He confirmed that he never sanded the glazing and it was not dusty. Thus, even if Plaintiffs had established that Mr. Kilgore used the glazing prior to 1979 and that it therefore contained asbestos (which is not established), Mr. Kilgore's use of the glazing was nothing more

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> See Plaintiffs' Opposition, p. 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> See Plaintiffs' Opposition, p. 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Exhibit A, 275:23-24; 281:25-282:3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> See Motion for Summary Judgment, p. 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Palmer v. Heidelberg USA, Inc., EDPA, No. 12-05034, USDC (October 10, 2014) [emphasis added].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> *Id.* at 6 [emphasis added].

than *de minimis*. He failed to establish dust inhalation from that glazing on a regular and frequent basis.

By way of further example, in <u>Gregg</u>, the Pennsylvania Court held that plaintiff's usage of Appellant's brakes (3 occasions of usage involving 30 minutes or less of exposure on each occasion) was *insufficient* to raise an inference that such exposure was a substantial contributing factor to plaintiff's injury.<sup>23</sup> In finding in favor of defendant, the <u>Gregg</u> Court cited to <u>Lohrmann</u>.<sup>24</sup> In <u>Lohrmann</u>, the plaintiff's exposure to the defendant's product was upwards of 15 occasions, sometimes with dust exposure lasting eight hours on each occasion.<sup>25</sup> That Court nonetheless held that such exposure was insufficient to demonstrated causation.<sup>26</sup>

Here, even assuming *all* facts in favor of plaintiffs, the entire "exposure" to DAP glazing was only 10 occasions – which Mr. Kilgore himself testified was "not often". <sup>27</sup> Plaintiffs do not dispute this. Of these 10 occasions, Mr. Kilgore himself admitted that he did not sand the glazing and it was *not dusty*. <sup>28</sup> No jury can reasonably conclude that 10 occasions of applying a wet product - which was not dusty - was a significant contributory factor to plaintiff's disease in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> <u>Gregg v. VJ Auto Parts</u>, 596 Pa. 274, 943 A.2d 216 (December 28, 2007), finding in favor of Appellant, V.J. Auto Parts in determining that *de minimis* exposure is insufficient to establish causation in dose-response diseases. In <u>Gregg</u>, the Court held that plaintiff's usage of Appellant's brakes (3 occasions of usage involving 30 minutes or less of exposure on each occasion) was *insufficient* to raise an inference that such exposure was a substantial contributing factor to plaintiff's injury. (Id.) Likewise, the <u>Gregg</u> Court made reference to <u>Lohrmann</u> in which that plaintiff's exposure (10 to 15 occasions for a duration of 1 to 8 hours of exposure over 39 years) was also insufficient to raise an inference of causation. <u>Lohrmann v. Pittsburg Corning Corporation</u>, 782 F.2d 1156, 1163 (4th Cir. 1986). The <u>Gregg</u> Court took notice of V.J. Auto Parts's argument that it was unfair of plaintiff to hale a peripheral defendant into court based on a minimal exposure, while ignoring plaintiff's 40 years of alternative exposure to asbestos. Gregg v. VJ Auto Parts, 596 Pa. 274, 943 A.2d 216 (December 28, 2007).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> See Motion for Summary Judgment, p. 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> *Id* 

the instant case. Where is Plaintiffs' opposition to this point? In accordance with Palmer,

Gregg, Howard, and Lohrmann, summary judgment must be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

## $\ \, WILBRAHAM, LAWLER \& BUBA \\$

By: /s/ Barbara J. Buba, Esq.
Barbara J. Buba, Esq.
Michael J. Block, Esq.
Attorney for Defendant, DAP, Inc.

Dated: November 5, 2014

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 5th day of November, 2014, a copy of the foregoing Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, was filed electronically this day and is available for viewing from the Court's ECF system. Notice of this filing will be sent to all counsel of record via the Court's ECF system

/s/ Barbara J. Buba, Esq.
Barbara Buba, Esq.
I.D. No. 36440
1818 Market Street, Suite 3100
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-564-4141
bbuba@wlbdeflaw.com

# **EXHIBIT A**

## IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF PHILADELPHIA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

- - -

VICTOR B. KILGORE & : JUNE TERM, 2013

JEAN KILGORE, h/w :

Plaintiffs

:

vs. :

:

ALLEN-BRADLEY COMPANY, :

et al :

Defendants : NO. 0881

- - -

Thursday, June 27, 2013

- - -

Continued Videotape Discovery
Deposition of VICTOR B. KILGORE, taken at
Marriott City Center, 500 Fayetteville Street,
Raleigh, North Carolina, commencing at 10:00
a.m., before Janice L. Welsh, Court Reporter
and Notary Public; in and for the Commonwealth
of Pennsylvania.

\* \* \*

VERITEXT NATIONAL COURT REPORTING COMPANY
MID-ATLANTIC REGION

1801 Market Street - Suite 1800 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Page 262 Page 264 1 1 VICTOR B. KILGORE VICTOR B. KILGORE 2 2 the ships you served on in the Navy? sites, and your time in the Navy, correct? 3 3 A. No. A. Correct. 4 **O.** Do you know the maintenance history of 4 **Q.** And she asked you at each location or 5 5 any of the pumps on any of the ships for which job site the specific products that you you served in the Navy? б 6 believe you were exposed to asbestos with, 7 7 A. No. correct? 8 8 MR. BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Mr. A. Correct. 9 Kilgore. Those are all the questions I have. 9 **Q.** And you either told her the manufacturer 10 VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: The time is 10 of that product or you stated that you didn't know the manufacturer, correct? 11 10:13 a.m. We're going off the record. 11 12 12 A. Yes. 13 13 **Q.** Then at some point after that (Whereupon a short recess was 14 taken.) 14 questioning you were handed a -- I believe it 15 15 was listed as Exhibit-1, and that was a 16 VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: The time is 16 caption to the case. 17 17 MR. PAUL: Yes. 10:13 a.m. We're back on the record. 18 18 BY MR. WHITE: 19 19 O. Prior to that you did not identify DAP **EXAMINATION** 20 20 as a manufacturer of any product that you were 21 21 BY MR. SKINNER: alleging exposure to asbestos, correct? 2.2 Q. Mr. Kilgore, I forgot one or two 2.2 A. Right. 23 questions. With respect to the Wrangell, do 23 **Q.** And then you saw the exhibit and you 24 you know any of the manufacturers of valves on 24 noted the company DAP, that you knew them, 25 25 that ship? correct? Veritext National Court Reporting Veritext National Court Reporting 215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690 215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690 Page 263 Page 265 VICTOR B. KILGORE 1 VICTOR B. KILGORE 1 2 A. No. 2 A. Yes. 3 3 Q. And you knew them because they made a MR. SKINNER: That's all the 4 4 questions I have for you. Thank you. lot of products, correct? 5 5 A. Yes. VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: The time is 10:14 a.m. We're off the record. 6 6 Q. But you're not alleging that you were 7 7 ever exposed to asbestos from any DAP 8 8 products, correct? (Whereupon a short recess was 9 9 taken.) A. That's right. 10 10 Q. So, at no point in your life you were 11 VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: The time is 11 ever exposed to asbestos from any DAP product 12 12 10:17 a.m. We're back on the record. that you know of, correct? 13 13 A. I couldn't swear to it. 14 14 Q. Do you remember what DAP products you **EXAMINATION** 15 15 worked around in your lifetime? 16 BY MR. WHITE: 16 A. Well, a small amount of spackle and 17 17 maybe some glazing. **Q.** Sir, can you hear me? 18 18 **Q.** Sir, when you say sometimes, when did 19 19 you work with these products? **Q.** My name is Edward White. I want to ask 20 20 you a few questions. Now, you remember your A. I don't know the dates or the years. 21 21 **Q.** How do you know they were DAP products? testimony yesterday? 22 22 A. Yeah. A. I read the label. 23 Q. You remember the first lady who asked 23 **Q.** What did the label say? 24 you questions, she went through all the 24 A. It said DAP. Other than that I don't 25 specific locations you lived, all your job 25 know what. Veritext National Court Reporting Veritext National Court Reporting 215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690 215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690

#### 1 VICTOR B. KILGORE

- 2 **Q.** When the product goes on it's moist,
- 3 correct?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 How long does that product take to cure?
- 6 It depends. 24 hours is ideal.
- 7 Sir, you also said you would later come
- 8 in and sand the joint compound, correct?
- 9 Yes. Correct.
- 10 When you sanded it you were given a mask
- to wear, correct? 11
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. What did you use to sand the joint
- 14 compound with?
- 15 Sandpaper.
- 16 Q. Do you know what grit sandpaper you
- 17 used?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 O. But it would have been a finer
- sandpaper, correct? 20
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 **Q.** Sir, you have no reason to believe that
- 23 the DAP product contained asbestos, correct?
- 24 A. I don't know.
- 25 Q. Sir, you also testified that you worked

### Veritext National Court Reporting

215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690

#### VICTOR B. KILGORE

- 2 a window a couple of times?
- 3 A. Well, more than a couple of times in 26
- 4

1

- 5 **O.** Can you estimate how many times you used
- 6 the DAP glazing? Could you give me a number?
- 7
- 8 **Q.** Around ten, correct?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 This was all to install windows, 0.
- 11 correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 **Q.** So, this was an outdoor procedure,
- 14 correct?
- 15 Yes. A.
- 16 **Q.** Now, the glazing, that's kind of the
- 17 final step in window installation, correct?
- 18
- 19 **O.** So, you have basically a finished
- 20 product, which is a window, and you're
- 21 applying that to a structure, correct?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 The glazing is used as a sealer, Q.
- 24 correct?

1

2

25 A. Correct.

### Veritext National Court Reporting

215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690

Page 275

Page 277 VICTOR B. KILGORE

- Q. So, a sealer by nature has to be 3 pliable, correct?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 **Q.** With heat and cold, objects can expand
- 6 and contract, correct?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 The glaze, which acts as a sealer, has
- 9 to be able to expand and contract with the
- 10 material, the sealant, correct?
- 11 Yeah. Mostly there's a hard glaze on
- 12 the outside, but the inside stays relatively
- 13 soft for a long time.
- 14 **Q.** So, this is a tar like material,
- 15 correct?
- 16 A. Well, it's white. I always think of tar
- 17 being black.
- 18 **Q.** But the consistency of the white glazing
- 19 is tar like, correct?
- 20 A. No. It would be thicker than that.
- 21 **Q.** Thicker than tar but still liquid,
- 2.2 correct?
- 23 It's still pliable. A.
- 24 **Q.** So, when you put the finished window
- 25 into the structure you apply the glazing?

#### Veritext National Court Reporting

215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690

- VICTOR B. KILGORE 2 with a DAP glazing, correct?
- 3 A. Yes.

1

- 4 Q. What kind of container did that DAP
- 5 glazing come in?
- 6 A. It was about a quart size.
- 7 Q. Quart size can. Do you remember the
- 8 label of the can?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 **Q.** What was the actual name of the product?
- 11 I'm not sure.
- 12 Sir, could you be confusing the name of
- 13 the products because you just know DAP from
- 14 other products it makes?
- 15 A. Possibly.
- 16 **Q.** So, you're not sure if you actually did
- 17 work with DAP glazing, correct?
- 18 Yeah. I'm sure I did work with it.
- 19 The DAP glazing, what did you apply the
- 20 DAP glazing to?
- 21 Well, if you had to replace window glass
- 22 it had to have new glazing put on it.
- 23 **Q.** How often did you use the DAP glazing?
- 24 A. Not often.
- 25 Q. Not often. So, you might have replaced

Veritext National Court Reporting

215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690

Page 281

#### 1 VICTOR B. KILGORE

- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 **Q.** Did you use a tool to smooth out the
- 4 glazing?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 What kind of tool was that? Q.
- 7 We call it a putty knife because
- 8 originally most glazing was putty.
- 9 So, after you smoothed out the glazing
- 10 that was pretty much it, correct?
- 11 That's right.
- 12 So, you wouldn't sand the finished
- 13 product, correct?
- 14 Α. No.
- 15 Now, to put the glazing on the window,
- 16 that's not a long process, is it?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 **Q.** Does that take about a minute to glaze a
- 19 window?
- 20 It depends on how much experience you
- 21 had. It would take me longer.
- 22 **Q.** How big was a window that you were
- 23 putting the glazing on?
- 24 A. Well, like ten by 12 inch or something
- 2.5 like that.

Veritext National Court Reporting

215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690

#### VICTOR B. KILGORE

- 2 **Q.** So, about the size of a lemon per
- 3 window?
- 4 Α. Yes.
  - **Q.** Sir, is this the same process, when you
- 6 were done with a putty knife you scrape the
- 7 rest in the can and wash it off with soap and
- 8 water?
- 9 A. No. Soap and water wasn't any good on
- 10 it.

1

5

- 11 You would just leave it on the putty
- 12 knife or throw the putty knife away?
- 13 A. No. You could let it dry and then
- 14 scrape it off.
- 15 **Q.** Wouldn't it make more sense to use
- 16 mineral spirits?
- 17 Well, we didn't always have mineral
- 18 spirits, and it wasn't necessary.
- 19 **O.** But you did have mineral spirits,
- 20 correct?
- 21 A. It was available.
- 22 And you used it sometimes, correct? Q.
- 23 Very seldom. A.
- 24 For at least part of the ten windows you
- 2.5 did, you cleaned the putty knife with mineral

Veritext National Court Reporting

215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690

Page 279

### VICTOR B. KILGORE

- 2 **Q.** A ten to 12 inch window?
- 3 A. Yeah. The glass in the window frame.
- 4 You know, there might be a dozen glass in one
- 5 frame.

1

- 6 **Q.** So, you did approximately ten windows.
- 7 Did they all have these multiple panes of
- 8 glass inside?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 **Q.** And you also said it took you a little
- 11 longer than a minute to do this. Do you know
- 12 how long it would take you to glaze a window?
- 13 The entire window.
- 14 A. Like I say, only doing one pane because
- 15 we're rust replacing broken stuff. It would
- 16 take two or three minutes to glaze an eight by
- 17 12.
- 18 Q. So, two or three minutes to do an eight
- 19 by 12. Would that be the pane or the entire
- 20 window?
- 21 A. That's just the pane.
- 22 **Q.** When doing an entire window, how much of
- 23 a can of glazing would you use?
- 24 A. About as big as a lemon maybe or a
- 25 little larger.

Veritext National Court Reporting 215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690 VICTOR B. KILGORE

2 spirits, correct?

1

11

- 3 A. No. I never used it.
- 4 Q. I thought you said you did use mineral
- 5 spirits sometimes?
- 6 A. Not in that particular place.
- 7 **Q.** Sir, you have no reason to believe that
- you were exposed to asbestos from using the
- 9 DAP glazing, correct?
- 10 A. That's right.
  - **Q.** Otherwise, you would have said it as a
- 12 product you were exposed to during the first
- 13 woman's examination yesterday, correct?
- 14 Yes. A.
- 15 0. Because it's not a dusty product?
- 16 A.
- 17 **Q.** So, sir, you have no reason to believe
- 18 you were ever exposed to asbestos from any DAP
- 19 product, correct?
- 20 A. No. I didn't know what DAP was made out
- 21 of.
- 22 **Q.** And those were the only two DAP products
- 23 that you used, correct?
- 24 A. That's right.
- 25 **Q.** You used glazing on about ten windows,

Veritext National Court Reporting 215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690

23 **Q.** There would be no reason for you to hold

24 it over your head and scrape it off, correct?

25 That's right.

Veritext National Court Reporting 215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690

- 21 O. So, that could have been DAP glazing or 22 it could have been another glazing sometimes?
- 23
  - A. Could have been.
- 24 Q. Sir, I want to take you back briefly to

25 yesterday. You had testified that about two Veritext National Court Reporting 215-241-1000 610-434-8588 1-302-570-0510 877 200-0118 888 777 6690

# EXHIBIT B

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

- - -

JEAN KILGORE, Executrix of : NO.: 13-CV-4029

the Estate of VICTOR B.

KILGORE, Deceased, and
widow in her own right,

:

Plaintiff,

:

v.

:

ALLEN-BRADLEY COMPANY, et al.,

:

Defendants.

\_ \_

February 21, 2014

- - -

Videotaped deposition of JAMES MILLER, taken pursuant to notice, was held at the Homewood Suites, Chesapeake Room, 4170 Philadelphia Road, Bel Air, Maryland 21015, commencing at 12:49 p.m., on the above date, before Rhonda Watson, Professional Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Maryland.

MAGNA LEGAL SERVICES (866)624-6221 www.MagnaLS.com



	Page 18		Page 20
1	BY MR. PRESENT:	1	product telling you that it was hazardous to your
2	Q. Okay. And when you would sand	2	health?
3	this material, what would happen to the	3	A. No.
4	atmosphere?	4	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection;
5	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection;	5	leading, foundation.
6	leading.	6	BY MR. PRESENT:
7	THE WITNESS: There would be dust	7	Q. And would this dust that you
8	in the air.	8	talked about that was generated from the sanding
9	BY MR. PRESENT:	9	occur each and every time you and Mr. Kilgore
10	Q. And when there was dust in the	10	were working with it?
11	air, would that be how close would Mr. Kilgore	11	A. Yes.
12	be to that dust?	12	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection.
13	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection.	13	BY MR. PRESENT:
14	THE WITNESS: Well, if it was	14	Q. You also mentioned the DAP caulk.
15	working on a ceiling, then it would be	15	Do you know of any other caulks
16	falling right down in your face.	16	that were used at the Aberdeen facility other
17	BY MR. PRESENT:	17	than DAP?
18	Q. Okay. And how about if you were	18	A. I can't recall any.
19	working on seams; would would it would	19	Q. Okay. And with respect to the DAP
20	there also be dust that would be in the air from	20	caulk, as you testified earlier, this was a moist
21	that when you would sand it?	21	product going on; is that correct?
22	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection.	22	A. Yes.
23	THE WITNESS: Usually it fell	23	Q. Were there times when you and
24	straight down, so not too much.	24	Mr. Kilgore would have to come back either in
	Page 19		Page 21
1	BY MR. PRESENT:	1	bathrooms or around windows or other places and
2	Q. Okay. Would you have to clean up	2	remove this caulk?
3	that dust after the job was over?	3	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection.
4	A. Yes.	4	THE WITNESS: Yes.
5	Q. Would Mr. Kilgore join you in that	5	BY MR. PRESENT:
6	endeavor?	6	Q. Had its consistency changed at
7	A. Yes.	7	that particular juncture?
8	Q. And I believe you testified that	8	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection.
9	that would happen approximately every two weeks	9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10	you'd be using it.	10	BY MR. PRESENT:
11	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection.	11	Q. In what way had it changed?
12	THE WITNESS: Approximately, yes.	12	A. It was hard and brittle.
13	BY MR. PRESENT:	13	Q. Okay. And when you would remove
14	Q. And with respect to the	14	that old caulk, based on your knowledge of the
15	Georgia-Pacific Ready-Mix, do you have any idea	15	types of caulks that were used at Aberdeen, do
16	how long it had been stored at Aberdeen?	16	you feel certain that it was DAP caulk that you
17	A. No.	17	were also taking off?
18	Q. Do you have any idea when it had	18	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection;
19	been manufactured? Like, how long before you	19	leading.
20	would use it	20	THE WITNESS: Possible good
21	A. No.	21	possibility.
22	Q it had been manufactured?	22	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Misstates prior
23	With respect to this Ready-Mix	23	testimony.
24	product, did you see any kind of warning on the	24	THE WITNESS: I can't speak for

	Page 22		Page 24
1	certain.	1	Q breathed in any dust or
2	BY MR. PRESENT:	2	particles?
3	Q. Okay. Were there times when you	3	A. No.
4	went back to the same place where you had applied	4	Q. You also talked about Armstrong
5	the DAP caulk and removed it sometime later?	5	tile.
6	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection.	6	Do you feel certain, sitting here
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.	7	today, that there were times when you would
8	BY MR. PRESENT:	8	remove old Armstrong tile from places where it
9	Q. Okay. And when you would do that	9	had been put in the Aberdeen facility?
10	and it had dried, would it have any impact or	10	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Object to form.
11	have any effect on the atmosphere or the air?	11	BY MR. PRESENT:
12	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Object to form.	12	Q. Where you had taken up old tile
13	THE WITNESS: There would be	13	that were Armstrong?
14	particles.	14	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Object to form;
15	BY MR. PRESENT:	15	calls for speculation.
16	Q. Okay. And would that happen each	16	THE WITNESS: Yes.
17	and every time you removed DAP	17	BY MR. PRESENT:
18	A. Most times.	18	Q. And with respect to that tile,
19	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection.	19	when you would take up the old Armstrong tile,
20	BY MR. PRESENT:	20	were you with Mr. Kilgore?
21	Q caulk that you would apply?	21	A. Yes.
22	A. Most times.	22	Q. How frequently would that happen?
23	Q. And where was Mr. Kilgore in	23	A. Once a week, once every two weeks.
24	relation to these particles that were in the	24	Q. And when you would do that, would
	Page 23		Page 25
1	atmosphere?	1	that have any effect on the atmosphere?
2	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Object to form.	2	A. Yes.
3	THE WITNESS: Next to them.	3	Q. And what would you see in the
4	BY MR. PRESENT:	4	atmosphere?
5	Q. Okay. And with respect to this	5	A. Dust.
6	DAP caulk, is that a product that you believe,	6	Q. And when the dust was in the air,
7	sitting here today, contained asbestos?	7	where was Mr. Kilgore in relation to that dust?
8	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection; calls	8	A. We were in it.
9	for speculation.	9	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Object to form.
10	THE WITNESS: Yes.	10	BY MR. PRESENT:
11	BY MR. PRESENT:	11	Q. Okay. Did you ever see any kind
12	Q. And how about with respect to the	12	of warning on any of the Armstrong tile packages
13	Ready-Mix product that you spoke of a little	13	telling you that breathing in that dust could be
14	earlier; is that a product that as you sit here	14	hazardous to your health?
15	today, you're convinced had asbestos?	15	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection.
16	A. Yes.	16	THE WITNESS: No, I don't remember.
17	Q. With respect to the DAP caulk, did	17	BY MR. PRESENT:
18	you ever see any kind of warning on that product	18	Q. And as you sit here today, are you
19	telling you that either you or Mr. Kilgore or	19	convinced that that Armstrong tile contained
20	anyone that used it could get sick if they	20 21	asbestos?
21 22	A. No.	21 22	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Object to form. BY MR. PRESENT:
23	DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection; leaded.	23	
23 24	BY MR. PRESENT:	23 24	Q. As you sit here right now, are you
4	DI WIK. FRESENI.	<b>∠</b> <del>1</del>	convinced